REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicant appreciates the interview with the Examiner wherein Applicant discussed the differences between the present invention and the cited prior art. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant amended claim 1 to clarify that the section or sections do not contact both substrates to distinguish over the prior art.

Claims 1-2, 5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuyoshi Kamimura (JP 06-281947) in view of Kubo et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0055082A1). In response, Applicant amended claim 1 to clarify that the section or sections are installed on either only one of the substrate surfaces which contact the liquid crystal layer, or independently on both of the surfaces wherein each section or sections does/do not contact both substrates, and respectfully traverse the rejection.

Kamimura is directed to a liquid crystal panel 11 that is formed from liquid crystal cells 13 segmented by wall surfaces 12. As shown in FIG. 1 of Kamimura, the wall surfaces 12 are attached to both substrates and completely seal the space between the wall surfaces. More specifically, each wall surface is connected to both substrates. Kamimura fails to disclose or suggest alignment direction controlling the section or sections that are installed on either one of the surfaces only which contact the liquid crystal layer, or each independently on both of the surfaces wherein the section or sections do not contact both substrates.

In contrast, as shown in FIGs. 16A-B of the present Application, for example, there are alignment direction controlling section(s) 27 formed on only one of the substrate

surfaces which contact the liquid crystal layer, or alternatively on both of the substrates' surfaces such that each of the section(s) does not contact both substrates. Further support for the above-described amendment can be found in FIGs. 12A-17B and related description in Applicant's Specification.

Kubo is merely cited for employing an arrangement of polarizers/compensators for achieving a sufficiently high contrast. However, Kubo also fails to disclose or suggest alignment direction controlling section(s) that are either installed on one of the surfaces which contact the liquid crystal layer only, or alternatively independently on both of the surfaces such that each section(s) does not contact both substrates. Therefore, any combination of Kamimura and Kubo fails to disclose or suggest this feature. For this reason, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-2, 5, and 8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-4, 6, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura, and further in view of one or more of Inoue et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0095229A1), Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,661,488), Park et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0147032A1), and/or Lin et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0156237A1). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the §103(a) rejection of independent claim 1.

The deficiencies of Kamimura are noted above. Inoue is merely cited for disclosing a second irradiation of active energy rays all over the substrate surface with voltage application. Takeda is merely cited for teaching a liquid crystal having a negative dielectric constant anisotropy. Park is cited for teaching at least one of two irradiation of

active energy rays being carried out along the direction tilted from a normal to a substrate surface. Lin is merely cited for disclosing a protruding structure 134 as a crisscross appearance. However, none of the Inoue, Takeda, Park, and Lin references disclose or suggest an alignment direction controlling section or sections installed on either one of the surfaces only which contact the liquid crystal layer, or each independently on both of the surfaces, such that each section or sections does/do not contact both substrates. For this reason, any combination of Kamimura with the above references fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections of claims 3-4, 6, and 9 is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 stands objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. In response, Applicants amended claim 2 to depend from claim 1 and further revised the claim to clarify that the liquid crystal layer has a section obtained by polymerizing a polymerizable compound through selective irradiation of active energy rays of the substrate surface without voltage application. Based on this amendment, withdrawal of the objection to claim 2 is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

If a Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response is required to make the attached response timely, it is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response in the above-identified application for the period required to make the attached response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required to this Application under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-2069.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By: Joseph P. Fox
Joseph P. Fox
Registration No. 41,760

Customer No. 24978
November 10, 2008
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
P:\DOCS\3408\73910\DN5074.DOC